PENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

REC'D	2.7	JAN	2005 .
WIPO			PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

(Rationalised Report according to the Notice of the President of the EPO published in the OJ11/2001)

(Italianiana rispora massa 8	•			
Applicant's or agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See Notificati Preliminary E	on of Transmittal of Internati Examination Report (Form Po	ional CT/IPEA/416)
International application No.	International filing date (day)	month year)	Priority date (day month/ye	ear)
	1		14/11/2002	· ·
PCT/IT03/00729 International Patent Classification (IPC) of	11/11/2003		14,22,2002	.
International Patent Classification (IPC)				-
	A62D5/00	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Applicant				
CL. COM ADVANCED TECHNOL	OGY et al.			
This international preliminary ex Authority and is transmitted to t	he applicant according to Article	30.	•	ng
2. This REPORT consists of a to	tal of sheets, including	ng this cover she	et.	Į .
This report is also accompanded and are the (see Rule 70.16 and Section	anied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheet basis for this report and/or sheet in 607 of the Administrative Instr	s of the descripti	on, claims and/or drawings wifications made before this Au	hich have thority
These annexes consists of a total	of sheets.			
3. This report contains indications	relating to the following items:			
I X Basis of the report			•	
II Priority		-		
	of opinion with regard to novelty,	inventive step a	nd industrial applicability	
IV Lack of unity of inv	ention		•	•
	under Article 35(2) with regard t	to novelty, invent	tive step or industrial applicab	ility;
V Reasoned statement citations and explana	ations supporting such statement			
VI Certain documents	cited			
VII Certain defects in th	e international application	٠		
VIII Certain observation	s on the international application	Ĺ		
	·		•	
	•			
. <u></u>				
Date of submission of the demand	D	ate of completion	_	
·		26.01.0	m	a Pata.
03/06/2004		80. Ol - c		ches ratentamp
		uthorized officer	wind.	ches Patentam.
Name and mailing address of the IPEA	' \^	lacino parional.		
European Patent Office D-80298 Munich		7amari	Louis Petit	
Tel. (+49-89) 2399-0, Tx: Fax: (+49-89) 2399-4465	523656 epmu d	Remanu	Truid I is	Office europe
Form PCT/IPEA/409 (cover sheet) P204	476 (October 2002) (23/12)	/2004)	- X - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2	9/012
LOUII LC 1/11 EW HOA (COAST SUSSE) L 50-	(2)	•	/1	Aus soilto

1. This rep invitation amendn	n una	er Article 14 are referred to in	s of (Replacement sheets wh this report as "originally filed	ich have been furnished to the receiving Office in response t and are not annexed to the report since they do not contain	ю а 7
		the international application	as originally filed		
	X	the description, pages	1 - 18	, as originally filed	
		pages		, filed with the demand	
,		pages	•	, filed with the letter of	
	X	the claims, Nos.		, as originally filed	
		Nos.	٠.	, as amended under Article 19	
		Nos.		, filed with the demand	
		Nos.	1 - 11	, filed with the letter of 8.11.0)4
	X	the drawings, sheets / fig.	1/2, 2/2	, as originally filed	
		sheets / fig.		, filed with the demand	
		sheets / fig.		, filed with the letter of	
2. The ame	ndme	ents have resulted in the canc	ellation of:		
		the description, pages:			
		the claims, Nos.	••	•	
		the drawings, sheets / fig.			
3. 🗷	This r beyor	report has been established a nd the disclosure as filed, as i	s if (some of) the amendmer ndicated below (Rule 70.2 (c	ats had not been made, since they have been considered to g	90

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

The documents as filed do not provide any basis for using the expression "gown" in the claims. the only disclosure refers to "overall" as indicated for instance in original claim 3.

Consequently examination will be carried out as if the expression "overall" had been used instead of the term "gown", ie, as if claims1 and 3 filed with letter dated 6.9.04 had been combined.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

PCT/IT03/00729

Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citation and explanations supporting such statement

 Statement 	t
-------------------------------	---

Novelty	Claims		YES
•	Claims	1 - 11	NO
Inventive Step	Claims		YES
	Claims		NO
Industrial Applicability	Claims	1 - 11	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and Explanations

The subject-matter of claims 1-11 is known from intermediate document (1) WO-A-03/041807 originating from the same inventors.

This document (1) was published on 22.05.03 before the date of filing of the present application on 11.11.03, and filed on 12.11.02 before the priority date of the present application on 14.11.02, by inventors who are the same as those mentioned in connection with the present application. This means that the priority application of 14.11.02 is not the first application disclosing for the first time any or all of the subject-matter of the present application, but that at least some of its subject-matter was disclosed in the above earlier application of 12.11.02 originating from the same inventjoas. Consequently the priority must be regarded as invalid (within the meaning of Rule 64.1(b)(ii) of the PCT), as far as said subject-matter was already disclosed in said document (1), in agreement with the provisions of the Paris Convention regulating the rights to priority.

As a result any subject-matter which was already disclosed in document (1) is regarded as being disclosed on 22.05.03 before effective date of filing of the present invention, and may be applied to assess novelty and inventive step.

It is clear from the disclosure in document (1) that the whole subject-matter of claim 1 is known from said document. The same objections apply to the additional features of claims 2 to 7.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

PCT/IT03/00729

The arguments of the Applicant regarding alleged differences in respect of the kind of clothing which is claimed are not convincing. Clearly overalls are disclosed in document (1) and the Applicant cannot argue that some overalls would be different from others, since overalls in the broadest definition are claimed in present claim 1.

The same objections apply to the various uses of claims 8 to 11 which are also disclosed in the same terms in document (1).